PLAINTIFFS' BREIF IN RESPONSE TO ORDER

Document 61

#:917

Filed 09/25/24 Page 1 of 2 Page ID

Case No. 2:22-cv-08685-SPG-SK

Case 2:22-cv-08685-SPG-SK

1	Based on the litigation in this case to date, Plaintiffs anticipate that the Court
2	will stay the case pending the resolution of the appeal in <i>Peridot Tree WA</i> , <i>Inc.</i> v.
3	Washington State Liquor and Cannabis Control Board, et al. 24-3481 (9th Cir.).
4	As this case has been pending for nearly two years, and Defendants have
5	argued the requirements of a California Cannabis Arrest or Conviction and of
6	residence in a Disproportionately Impacted Area do not violate the dormant
7	Commerce Clause, Plaintiffs would prefer to begin discovery on the disparate
8	impact of those requirements on out-of-state applicants.
9	Nevertheless, anticipating that the Court will stay this action, Plaintiffs ask
10	that if the Ninth Circuit holds that the dormant Commerce Clause does not apply to
11	cannabis licenses, the Court maintain the stay until the certiorari process has ended
12	to avoid a potentially unnecessary appeal of this case to the Ninth Circuit.
13	
14	DATED: September 25, 2024 JEFFREY M. JENSEN, PC
15	
16	By: /s/ Jeffrey M. Jensen
17	Jeffrey M. Jensen Attorney for plaintiffs Variscite, Inc. and
18	Kenneth Gay
19	
20	DATED: September 25, 2024 KERNKAMP LAW APC
21	
22	By: <u>/s/ Christian Kernkamp</u> Christian Kernkamp
23	Attorney for plaintiff Variscite, Inc. and
24	Kenneth Gay
25	
26	
27	
28	
	2 Case No. 2:22-cv-08685-SPG-SK